Monographs on Africana Librarianship No. 5

The Effects of Job Satisfaction on Publication Output among Librarians in Africa: A Case Study from Nigerian Universities

by

U. SELONG EDEM

B.Sc. (Hons.) Sociology (Calabar), MLS, PhD (Ibadan, Nigeria)
Senior Librarian, University of Calabar

African Studies Program
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
c1997

ISBN # 0-941934-73-X

DEDICATION

Dedicated to practicing librarians in Nigerian universities for their perserverance in spite of the harsh socio-economic environment in which they work. They kindly offered themselves unwittingly as guinea pigs for testing some of the ideas expressed in this monograph.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the efforts and contribution of Dr. Morayo I. Atinmo, dissertation supervisor at the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, for constructive criticisms and thought-provoking ideas, which contributed towards shaping the quality and clarity of ideas presented in this monograph. I thank Professor Gabriel T. Onadiran, Head, Department of Library Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria, who examined the dissertation and encouraged me to publish the work after effecting minor corrections. Also, I wish to thank Professor Briggs C. Nzotta, Head, Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, and all of the lecturers in that department for the joint efforts in developing in me the skills of research.

At this point, I would like to acknowledge the significant contributions of Dr. Nancy J. Schmidt, Editor, Monographs on Africana Librarianship, for her critical reading and the "scholarly spirit" with which she assisted me with sound suggestions and guidance. I appreciate the remarkable efforts of Professor York Bradshaw, Director, African Studies Program, Indiana University, who took pains to go through the computer statistical analysis as well as suggest ways for the presentation of data.

Finally, I wish to thank the University of Calabar Senate Research Grant Committee for funding this research work, as well as offering me the University of Calabar Doctoral Study Fellowship for three years. I sincerely thank the university librarians sampled for finding time to complete and return the questionnaires on time in spite of their busy schedules of work.

I appreciate the help rendered by my wife, Eme-ette, who read the entire manuscript and made valuable suggestions.

PREFACE

In the fifth monograph in the Monographs on Africana Librarianship series, which focuses on the practice of librarianship in Africa, Dr. Edem has presented data on the relationship between job satisfaction and publication by university librarians in Nigeria which he collected for his dissertation at the University of Ibadan. Dr. Edem conducted a survey of the literature on this topic using the resources available to large university libraries in Nigeria to which he relates the data he collected. Readers of this monograph who are aware of other recent sources on this topic, which are not available in Nigerian university libraries, may want to send copies to Dr. Edem (University of Calabar Library, PMB 1115, Calabar, Nigeria) for use in his future research.

We are pleased to be able to facilitate the dissemination of Dr. Edem's dissertation research to a wider audience in the Monographs on Africana Librarianship series. We would be interested in receiving manuscripts based on research on job satisfaction of librarians in other African countries to consider for publication in the series. Instructions for the submission of manuscripts are available from the series editor, African Studies Program, 221 Woodburn Hall, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA.

Nancy J. Schmidt
Editor, Monograph Series on Africana Librarianship

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

It is an undisputed fact that the library job in Africa and even in developed countries is primarily service oriented work. Work has been seen by scholars as an essential aspect of human life in every society. It could be used as an index of measuring success or failure. Also, it could be used as an instrument to determine input and output ratios of human endeavour in work organisation.

Library work requires both professional and non-professional skills by personnel. Such personnel need to be motivated so that they can perform their duties creditably and contribute towards the achievement of library goals, policies and objectives. It is assumed that motivation normally leads to high job productivity or performance by workers. In African universities the library is seen as the "engine house" for academic activities. As such, library personnel, especially the professionals, need to be motivated so as to perform their duties creditably.

Since the present global economic recession began in the early 1980s, the acquisition of resources and personnel budgets for librarians in some West African universities have been dwindling as indicated in the literature by Lawal (1986,1991) and Alemna (1993). The harsh socio-economic environment in Nigeria in particular, and other West African countries in general, makes one wonder if librarians are really satisfied with their jobs and actually have the incentive to publish. Arguably, a knowledge of librarians' motivational level could assist university authorities to improve the librarians' efficiency, effectiveness, and enhance their publication productivity. Chwe (1978:139) has noted that the practical value of job satisfaction has been widely recognized by behavioural scientists, as well as managers and administrators, for achieving effectiveness and high productivity in organisation. It also was noted that modern managerial concepts such as participatory management, productivity, job design, job involvement, job enrichment and enlargement are designed to achieve organisational goals by improving employee job satisfaction.

Indeed, an understanding of the dimensions of job satisfaction has been recognised as a significant factor for the effective management of many occupational groups. As librarians with academic status continue to turn their attention toward some managerial issues, it is important that the effects of job satisfaction on publication output within the context of the academic library profession be studied in detail. Such research results could help in discovering new managerial strategies which could enhance high publication output among librarians who are academic staff in Nigerian universities in particular and other African universities in general.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1978:203) assert that the library building represents 5%, while the quality of staff represents 45% of what it takes to make a good library. A trend in library research focuses on the world of work of librarians concerning professional services, work environment, and logistic deployment of professional staff. The various needs of such staff are studied and regulated by the organisation. This trend, though of great importance in developed countries, has gained little recognition in developing

countries such as Nigeria, Ghana, Togo, Sierra Leone, and Côte d'Ivoire to mention a few.

A pertinent research focus would be to examine the effects of job satisfaction on publication output of librarians. To use Frederick Herzberg's (1968:53) terminology, the hygenic "factors or dissatisfiers" – salary, fringe benefits, working conditions, status, etc. – are present in academic life as they are in other work situations. However, the motivational factors i.e. promotion, achievement, recognition, job description, personal development, and responsibility are far more prevalent in universities than they are in many other institutional environments, and, as noted by Tuckman (1976:112), their impact is consequently more persuasive. Furthermore, it is recognisable that librarians' publication output, especially since the early 1980s when librarians in Nigerian universities became academic staff, depends solely on job satisfaction in their work place. As a result, if the different dimensions of job satisfaction are known and improved upon, publication output might increase and quality library services would be attainable.

Publications are required of both lecturers and librarians for advancement in the Nigerian university system, as indicated on the table below.

Table 1: Librarians' Ranks, Qualifications, Work Experience, Number of Publications Required and Annual Income Earned in Nigerian Universities

RANKS	QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	PUBLICATIONS REQUIRED	ANNUAL INCOME
Graduate Assistant	A good first degree in any discipline and an interest in library work	None	$568.19
Assistant Librarian	A good first degree plus MLS degree	None	$674.06
Librarian II	A good first degree plus MLS with 3 years at Asst. Librarian, or PhD	None	$772.66
Librarian I	First degree plus MLS or PhD with 3 years at Librarian II position	3 journal articles in a refereed journal	$1,044.83
Senior Librarian	First degree plus MLS or PhD with 3 years at Librarian I position	5 journal articles in a refereed journal	$1,148.06
Deputy University Librarian	First degree plus MLS or PhD with 3 years at Senior Librarian position	15 journal articles in a refereed journal	$1,347.68
University Librarian	First degree plus MLS or PhD with 3 years at Deputy University Librarian position, depending on availability or vacancy	20 journal articles in a refereed journal	$1,407.48

Job satisfaction could elicit publication output among academic staff because they are expected to write and publish before they are promoted. This promotion enhances their status, rank, and salary in Nigerian universities. Publishing gives national and international visibility to the writer. Again, it may be argued that librarians publish based on professional experiences and this is good for the knowledge base of librarianship and the academic community.

Several writers in sociology and management science agree that an employee needs a little push to keep working with interest, vigour, and pride. Librarians in Nigerian universities are no exception to this assertion. According to Drucker (1972:236), "happy workers are efficient and productive workers." One can then assume that if librarians are happy and satisfied, they will become productive in terms of publishing. Thus, the hypothesis that publication output is a function of job satisfaction. As such, for publication output to be high, the job satisfaction of the librarian must be ensured always. With a rate of inflation over 72% and economic crisis in Nigeria, workers are not satisfied and their performances are being affected. For instance, Douglas (1988) confirmed that the present economic crunch in Nigeria had made it impossible for normal working conditions to operate especially in university libraries. She observed that academic libraries could no longer acquire enough books for various disciplines offered, subscribe to journals, and look into staff welfare and job satisfaction.

In order to shed light on personnel management and productivity in African librarianship, the researcher carried out an investigation on librarians working in Nigerian universities as a case study. It is hoped that the result of the study presented in this report will be of value in personnel management or librarians' motivational factors in influencing or determining publication productivity in Nigeria and other African countries.

1.2 Previous studies on the effects of job satisfaction on publication output

Many studies have been made on job satisfaction of workers especially in developed countries, but few have been made in Africa and this creates a relative lack of information. Wahba (1975:45) has noted that job satisfaction and motivation of many professional and non-professional groups such as accountants, engineers, middle managers, insurance agents, research scientists, assembly workers, and nurses have been studied extensively by behavioural scientists in the 1970s and 1980s. The author also asserted that one group of professionals which has been virtually ignored is that of librarians. She described the situation as unfortunate because most of the studies on job satisfaction have concluded that job satisfaction differs from one occupation to another.

In developed countries such as the USA and UK many research studies have focused on job satisfaction among librarians as indicated in the library science literature by Vaughan and Dunn (1974), Plate and Stone (1974), D'Elia (1979), Burgess (1982), McNally (1983), and Swasdison (1990). Elton Mayo's human relations movement emphasized the well-being of individuals in a work situation and he advanced this theory. Mayo and his followers including Maslow (1943), Simon (1958), Luthans (1979), and Herzberg (1968) claimed that job satisfaction leads to improved performance. Porter and Lawler (1968:118) asserted emphatically that it is performance that brings satisfaction rather than the other way around. They concluded that "good performance may lead to rewards which in turn lead to satisfaction."

Unfortunately, I was not able to find much research on job satisfaction among librarians in West African countries, except for a few studies done in Nigeria by Atinmo (1978), Nzotta (1984), Nkereuwem (1990) and Edem (1995). In respect to universities in the USA, Rayman and Goudy (1980) argued that for all librarians working in university libraries, irrespective of sex, age, academic qualification, and level of motivation, the task to publish will be a difficult exercise. In a similar study, Mitchell and Swieszkowski (1985) upheld this conclusion about librarians in American university libraries.

In testing these assertions this study examines the effects of job satisfaction on publication output among librarians in Nigerian universities. To guide the study, two hypotheses were stated:

1. There is no significant effect of job satisfaction on academic publication output among librarians in Nigerian universities.
2. There is no significant effect of job satisfaction on work related publication output among librarians in Nigerian universities.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CONCEPTS OF JOB SATISFACTION AND PUBLICATION OUTPUT

2.1 The concept of job satisfaction

Studies have been conducted on job satisfaction of workers in developed countries of the world since the pioneering work of Hoppock in the USA (1935). Ejiogu (1980) has noted that ever since the pioneering efforts of Hoppock and Houser (1938), research and theory on the nature, causes, and correlates of job satisfaction have mushroomed. Similarly, Gruneberg (1976:114) observed that by 1969, for example, it was estimated that the number of job satisfaction studies could well have exceeded four thousand. Probably, the interest generated in this area rested on the assumption that a satisfied worker was invariably an efficient and effective employee, and that if management could know what gave its employees satisfaction, efficiency and productivity would be achieved.

In this study, job satisfaction is viewed as a unitary concept which is constituted of many dimensions, namely psychological, economical, physiological, and environmental, that bring out satisfaction in the work place. Indeed, it is the combination of these various dimensions that can really make one express job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is seen from a multidimensional perspective of ten dimensions: achievement, responsibility, recognition, advancement, work itself, salary, job security, office accommodation, university policies and administration, and supervision. Of these ten dimensions, the first five are termed and viewed as the "intrinsic dimensions," while the last five are termed the "extrinsic dimensions" by the researcher. These terminologies are commonly used in library management literature and do not need redefinition.

2.2 The concept of publication output

Not much has been written on the concept of publication output among librarians. The concept of publication output used for my research measures various works in terms of the number of books or chapters of books written, journal articles published, conference/workshop proceedings/papers published, and work related publications such as abstracts, bibliographies, and indexes published. These publication outputs are used in assessing the academic excellence of librarians as for their counterparts who are lecturers. Furthermore, publication enhances the librarian's rank and salary position in the process of career advancement in the profession.

Stueart (1976:155) noted that librarians in the USA had done an adequate job in advancing library interest in terms of publishing. He argued that "if writing had a high priority for career advancement, then we write." For his research in the USA, Stephens (1976) conceptualized publication output as a way in which research results, speculation, criticism, intellectual enquiry, and other creative efforts of individuals are fulfilled. Thus, scholars including Stueart (1976) and Stephens (1976) argued that those who did not publish did not necessarily perish, but they did not help fulfill the function of a university as a source of new knowledge and insight--a function that was too frequently unrecognised especially in Africa. Harrison's research in the USA (1982) supported publication output for assessing librarians' advancement and observed that librarians who wrote did so only because they had something to say about libraries and librarianship.

This scholar noted with dismay that the majority of librarians who did not write, were firmly of the opinion that too much had already been written by colleagues in the profession. Onadiran (1978) expressed the same view for Nigerian librarians.

The concept of publication output referred to those academic and work related publications which are usually used in assessing one for promotion in terms of publishing. To lecturers and librarians working in a university environment, publication output was seen as an important psychological factor in one's life because it enhanced advancement and brought fulfillment of academic and intellectual achievements and contributions to knowledge in particular. Consequently, this concept should be given priority in university environments in Africa and Nigeria in particular as a developing country.

The researcher visited the three oldest university libraries in Nigeria at Ibadan, Nsukka and Zaria to search for published works on the effects of job satisfaction on publication output among African librarians. Unfortunately, not much was found and the few studies on Nigeria by Atinmo (1978), Nzotta (1984), and Nwafor (1987) did not say much about other West African countries.

2.3. Review of studies on the effects of job satisfaction on publication output among librarians

2.3.1. Effects of achievement on publication output

Marchant (1976:58-62) noted that academic librarians in the USA who showed strong liking for academic achievement had strong trust and confidence in the concept of publication output. Jauch and Glueck (1975) observed that academic achievement of university professors in the USA could be measured by a simple count of the number of publications in respectable journals. It appeared that getting colleagues to agree on the quality of journals or publications for the list would pose some problems.

Chwe (1978) who compared reference librarians and cataloguers in university libraries in the USA, noted that while there was no significant difference in the overall satisfaction of reference librarians and cataloguers, there were differences on individual dimensions of the 20 factors measured. Cataloguers were most satisfied with the aspects of moral values, activity, and achievement, while reference librarians were most satisfied with moral values, social service, and activity.

2.3.2 Responsibility

It seems that there has been little research to determine the effects of responsibility as a dimension of job satisfaction on publication output. Scheck (1970) noted that 64% of the articles published in the **PNLA Quarterly** were contributed by academic librarians who held responsible positions such as heads of divisions, departments, and sections in university libraries. This supported the fact that the position of responsibility held had influenced or motivated such librarians to be productive in terms of publishing.

2.3.3. Recognition

Jones (1984:84) noted that professional recognition given to librarians in the UK could increase intrinsic interest in library and information work by providing a sense of service and social opportunities when given to members of staff who deserved it by library

management. He observed that professional recognition given to librarians was a fundamental source of productivity and confirmed belongingness identity.

Plate and Stone (1974) had earlier indicated that achievement and recognition were the most important dimensions of job satisfaction among practicing librarians in university libraries in the USA. Unfortunately, these scholars did not mention whether this factor influenced or affected publication productivity among the librarians they studied.

2.3.4 Advancement

Aguolou (1982) observed that university administrators in Nigeria created limited incentives, opportunities for growth, education, and advancement for their librarians, hence low publication productivity. Nzotta (1984:12) noted that compensation, advancement, and poor working conditions (physical surroundings) were the lowest ranked aspects of job satisfaction which could influence their job performance. This meant that most librarians were not satisfied with their advancement prospects and working conditions in Nigerian universities.

2.3.5. Work itself

Roberts (1973) noted that experience gained and changes of duties and posts became important to job satisfaction of librarians in the UK, while the causes of dissatisfaction were the nature of the work and unsatisfactory working conditions. In their local scene, Unomah (1990) observed that one of the practical difficulties militating against Nigerian librarians obtaining job satisfaction was the rigidity of their work hours, which makes it difficult for them to incorporate study and research into their already crowded professional schedules. Librarians working in Nigerian universities put in 40 hours per week and participate in morning and evening shift duties weekly. Ononogbo (1988) opined that university library resources had been on the decline since the economic recession started in 1982. The implication of this for university libraries was reduced service capacity, which also impinged on library staff and user satisfaction in general.

2.3.6. Supervision

D'Elia (1979) noted that supervision on the job as a characteristic of job satisfaction had positive influence on job performance of the librarians he studied in the UK. He concluded that a good supervisory climate was necessary for the librarians to exercise initiative and professional judgement in the performance of the job, as well as a factor conducive to job satisfaction.

Contrarily, Plate and Stone (1974) noted that most of the unhappiness was related to supervisors. They emphasized the importance of human relations as a strategy to remedy the situation.

2.3.7. University policies and administration

Chwe (1978:140), who compared job satisfaction among reference librarians and cataloguers in selected American university libraries, indicated that these two groups listed university policies and administration as their second least satisfying dimension of job satisfaction among the three least satisfying dimensions they were requested to indicate.

Atinmo (1978:108) indicated that 68% of librarians in the Nigerian universities she studied expressed dissatisfaction with this dimension of job satisfaction as a result of rigidity or inflexibility of policies.

2.3.8. **Salary**

Lack of salary breeds anxiety among workers and threatens their hope of satisfying some desired wants, aspirations, or needs. Vroom (1964:178) noted that the salary happened to be a means of obtaining desired needs. Gellerman (1963:166) emphasized the instrumental function of salary as a motivator, as well as status symbol. Whereas Atinmo (1978:110) observed that there was a significantly high response rate of dissatisfaction among Nigerian librarians with their wages and salaries in 1978, she contended that this was a reflection of the inflation rate of 34.5% in Nigeria at the time of her study. Today, the inflation rate is more than 72% and the value of the naira which was once at parity with the US dollar, is now 80 naira to one dollar.

2.3.9. **Office accommodation**

Roberts (1973) observed that an overwhelming majority of librarians he studied in the UK were satisfied with their work and working situations. He then predicted that such satisfaction with office accommodation would enhance their job productivity. On the local scene, Nzotta (1984:12) noted that librarians in Nigeria were not satisfied with their working environment. He observed that most libraries in Nigeria were short of space – office, storage, shelving, for example, – and asserted that most libraries were housed in temporary, make-shift accommodations. Contrarily, Swasdison (1990) showed that between administrative and non-administrative librarians in Thailand, the former had significantly higher satisfaction with the individual factors, except the factor of office accommodation. The effects of office accommodation as a dimension of job satisfaction on publication productivity among librarians working in Nigerian university libraries has not been given proper attention. The result of this study will contribute to fill this gap in the library science literature.

2.3.10. **Job security**

Having examined some available literature at university libraries at Ibadan, Zaria, Nsukka, and Calabar in Nigeria, it was noted with surprise that job security as a dimension of job satisfaction had not been properly focused on by scholars. Although this phenomenon was noted in the American literature, from the literature examined, this dimension had been mentioned without really determining its effects on job productivity. To fill this gap, this study will examine its effects on publication productivity among librarians in Nigerian universities.

2.3.11. **Concluding remarks on literature review**

Although research has been conducted on job satisfaction of librarians in developed countries, especially the USA and UK, there is a dearth of information and empirical studies on publication output among librarians in developing countries, including Nigeria and other African countries The relative lack of information in these areas of

personnel management and performance in African library settings motivated this study to be undertaken.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

3.1 Characteristics of the respondents

During the 1992/93 academic session, the researcher decided to study the effects of job satisfaction on publication output among librarians in Nigerian universities with a questionnaire. Having stratified his sample size, he personally visited the respondents in Nigeria between March and August 1992 with funds for fieldwork provided by the University of Calabar Senate Research Grant Committee. The fieldwork enabled the researcher to clarify the questionnaire for the respondents.

Of the 278 questionnaires administered, 202 were properly completed and returned to the researcher. This response rate of 72.66% was adequate for data analysis. The biographical characteristics of the respondents -- sex, age, working experience, library division, and academic qualifications -- were recorded and classified in the tables found in Appendices 1-5.

3.2. Data collection method

The questionnaire method was selected to collect data for the research because it ensured quantifiable responses for the same items from all respondents. Furthermore, it saved both time and cost to distribute and analyze.

3.3 The research instrument

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Section A contained ten items that were based on personal or biographical information of the respondents. The questions were worded so that responses could be quantified.

Section B included items measuring ten dimensions of job satisfaction based on a slightly modified version of the short form of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Two questions tested each of the dimensions of job satisfaction in the study. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire instrument met the accepted standards for reliability and showed enough evidence of validity test.

Section C included 20 items which determined the publication output, academic and work-related problems of librarians. The responses were quantified and analyzed statistically. To ensure a high response rate and to explain certain items of the instrument to respondents, the researcher administered the questionnaires himself. The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix 14.

3.4. Methodology

A stratified random sampling method was used to select 278 librarians working in 22 out of the 35 university libraries in Nigeria. All the universities were categorized into five groups consisting of a) federal universities (conventional); b) universities of agriculture; c) state universities; d) state universities of technology; and e) federal universities of technology. Thereafter, universities were randomly selected from each of the five groups. The asterisked ones were randomly selected for the study as shown in Appendix 6.

Stratified random sampling ensures that respondents in each category have an equal probability of being selected. Finally, all available librarians in the sample population were given questionnaires irrespective of sex, age, status, and academic qualifications.

Respondents were requested to check their responses on ten major job satisfaction dimensions which were placed on a five-point Likert Scale of measurement weighed as follows:

5 = representing that the respondent is completely satisfied
4 = representing that the respondent is satisfied
3 = representing that the respondent is undecided
2 = representing that the respondent is unsatisfied
1 = representing that the respondent is completely dissatisfied.

The modified version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), designed by the Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, USA, was used. Each dimension of job satisfaction had two questions. The sum total of all ten dimensions represents the general satisfaction level.

The respondents also were requested to check on a six point scale to express their level of publication within the past seven years beginning from 1985 - 1992 thus:
1) None; 2) 1-3; 3) 4-7; 4) 8-11; 5) 2-15; and 6) 16 and above publications.
It is pertinent to state here that the publication output survey statistics were categorised into two major dimensions, first, academic publication output, i.e. journal articles, books, accepted or published conference/workshop papers; and second, work related publication output, i.e. abstracts, indexes, bibliographies, and in-house publications.

Quantitative values were attached to the responses in the questionnaire as indicated above and the means of responses were computed for each publication dimension using the appropriate Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer programme. In determining the effects of job satisfaction on publication output, a multiple regression analysis equation was worked out with this model:

$$Y = C + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + \ldots U$$

where Y = the dependent variable
C = the constant
b_1 = an unstandardized regression coefficient
X_1 = an independent variable
U = the error term.

The equation was solved for each dimension by means of a step-wise solution multiple regression. In the step-wise solution the tests are performed at each step to determine the effects or contributions of each variable already in the equation if it were entered last. By so doing this makes it possible to select a set of independent variables of job satisfaction dimensions that best predict academic or work related publication output and thereby eliminate superfluous variables. The order of inclusion of the independent variables is determined by the contribution of each variable to explain the variance in the dependent variable. In this case the variable that explains the greatest amount of variance is entered first, the variable that explains the greatest amount of variance in conjunction with the first variable is entered second and so on. The independent variables which do not meet the pre-established statistical criteria for inclusion in the equation are deleted at each successive step.

3.5. Data analysis

In starting the analysis, a correlation matrix was constructed to determine the strength or effect and relationship of the ten dimensions of job satisfaction on the academic publication output dimension. The ten dimensions of job satisfaction were correlated with academic publication output. The essence of the correlation exercise was to critically determine the relationship between each of the ten dimensions of job satisfaction with the academic publication output dimension. Each of the ten dimensions of job satisfaction was used in stating a null hypothesis as regards the academic publication output among librarians in Nigerian universities.

The result of the correlation matrix appears in Appendix 7.

For the purpose of clarity,analysis of variance statistics were computed based on each dimension of job satisfaction on the publication output dimension. The essence was to determine which of the variables actually had effects on publication output dimension.

A significant aspect of the data analysis is that of the ten dimensions of job satisfaction, only three, namely,

1. achievement (*$P<0.05$; df = 1,155; $F = 8.836$) (See Appendix 8)
2. responsibility (*$P<0.05$; df = 1,155; $F = 4.907$) (See Appendix 9)
3. recognition (*$P<0.05$; df = 1,155; $F = 4.676$) (See Appendix 10)

had significant effects on academic publication output. The results of the analysis of variance statistics computed after the correlation exercise for each of the dimensions which showed positive effects on publication output are shown in Appendix 8 (achievement), Appendix 9 (responsibility), and Appendix 10 (recognition).

The other seven dimensions of job satisfaction: advancement, work itself, salary, university policies and administration, office accommodation, supervision, and job security, did not have significant effect on academic publication output as shown in Appendix 11.

Continuing the data analysis, a correlation analysis was made to determine the different levels of relationship between job satisfaction and work related publication. The same procedure was followed as stated above. The result of the correlation analysis appears in Appendix 12. It showed that most of the relationships are below the 0.05 level of statistical significance used in the study. Consequently, the analysis of variance statistics were computed to determine the effects of each of the job satisfaction dimensions on work related publication output as shown in Appendix 13. Surprisingly, none of the dimensions had a significant effect on work-related publication output.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1. Findings

The results show that Nigerian university librarians' satisfaction with their academic/professional achievement had the most significant effect on their academic publication output. This is in line with other studies such as Chwe (1978), who compared reference and catalogue librarians in US university libraries and noted that achievement ranked very high as a factor which gave librarians job satisfaction. Thus, achievement was seen in terms of their own academic improvement on the job, such as acquiring additional academic and professional qualifications. Collaterally, the quest for higher degrees may motivate librarians to publish. Such additional academic qualifications expose librarians to acquisition of new knowledge, methods of data collection and organisation, and writing for publication. It is the researcher's view that staff development should be pursued more vigorously for librarians in university or academic libraries, especially in African countries.

4.2. Discussion of results

A significant aspect of the data is that assigned responsibility encourages librarians to be more productive in academic publications than those who are not so satisfied. This result agrees with those of Atinmo (1978) and D'Elia (1979). Responsibility in this study is seen as the opportunity given to the librarian to exercise authority. Such librarians are heads of departments, divisions, sections, and units. Sometimes they are given responsibilities to attend conferences, workshops, and seminars, and are even mandated to represent the university librarian at either faculty board meetings or departmental committee meetings. In addition, they are assigned the responsibility of designing new programmes, heading task forces, and possibly writing proposals for or reports on projects.

The data also show that librarians who are satisfied with the recognition accorded them are significantly more productive than those who are not satisfied in respect of their academic publication as shown in Appendix 8. This finding agrees with Plate and Stone (1974) who studied the factors which give librarians satisfaction in university libraries in the USA. Their research revealed that recognition and achievement are the two most important dimensions of job satisfaction which motivate librarians in university libraries. Similarly, Nkereuwem (1990) noted that junior staff members in university libraries in Nigeria seem to be satisfied with the recognition for a job well done more than anything else given them by their respective senior officers. Jones (1984) also affirmed from his research in the UK that the amount of recognition one gets as a university librarian increases a sense of identity and respect to those who deserve it. He concluded that recognition is a "fundamental source of self confirming belongingness identity" (1984: 84).

Unfortunately, in this study, recognition did not have a positive effect on work-related publication output. Probably some librarians felt that work-related publication would not give them national and international visibility and recognition or qualitative assessment for promotion.

The other dimensions, namely salary, university policies, work itself, office accommodation, job security, advancement, administration, and supervision did not have significant effect on either academic or work-related publications. This result confirms that of Atinmo (1978), Nzotta (1984), and Lawal (1991) that salary does not have influence on job performance among Nigerian librarians working in universities.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

In this study we have examined the effects of job satisfaction on publication output among librarians working in Nigerian universities. The study results show that only three dimensions, achievement, responsibility, and recognition, had significant effects on academic publication output. Other factors including advancement, work itself, office accommodation, job security, salary, university policies and administration, and supervision did not influence publication output.

The urge for academic achievement had the greatest effect on publication output. The librarians who attained higher degrees published or shared their research experiences with others.

The level of responsibility given to the librarian was noted to have influenced publication output. It was also observed that librarians who were quite satisfied with the responsibilities assigned to them were quite productive in terms of publishing.

It was equally noted that those librarians who were satisfied with the recognition accorded them were more productive than those who were accorded less recognition. So recognition was seen as stimulating the librarian to be productive in terms of publishing.

Professional advancement prospects such as promotion did not positively affect publication output. This means some librarians were not satisfied with their advancement prospects because they were expected to have had a certain number of publications before promotion or advancement on the job as indicated in the table on page 2. This promotion requirement affected their chances of advancement on the job , hence the negative effect or result.

It was surprising to observe that the work itself did not have a positive effect on publication output. It could be concluded that opportunities and resources were not adequate and did not give librarians satisfaction or propel them to be involved in research work for publication.

Librarians' satisfaction with their present salary and salary prospects did not show a positive relationship with their publication output. The average annual salary of the respondents was $948.85. Probably their salary did not satisfy their daily needs and consequently did not motivate them to work harder and become more productive in terms of publishing. Some Nigerian librarians do extra work such as trading or contacts for goods and services in order to make ends meet. Some librarians as well as university faculty have migrated to other countries such as Ghana, Kenya, Namibia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe where they can earn higher salaries.

Again, librarians' satisfaction with the type of supervision they received from their supervisors on technical aspects, e.g., cataloguing and classification, did not contribute much in terms of publishing new ideas and contributing to new knowledge, hence this negative result.

The type of office accommodation given to the librarians did not show significant effect with their publication output in Nigerian university libraries. Consequently, whether they sat with readers or not, it did not enhance their productivity in terms of publishing.

Librarians' satisfaction with university policies and administrative styles did not show significant effect on their publication output. Nor did their satisfaction with job security have significant effects on publication output. This meant that the librarians were sure of retiring at age 65 with some benefits after working for 35 years. As such, whether a librarian published or not, although promotion could have been slow, he or she was sure of going home with retirement benefits.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the results summarized above and in the appendices, the following recommendations are made to university authorities in Africa in general and Nigerian university libraries in particular.

1. Since academic achievement influences publication output, it is recommended that librarians should be encouraged to obtain higher academic and professional qualifications. Higher academic qualifications should be tied to a higher salary structure to both encourage those who have obtained such qualifications and motivate those who have not obtained such qualifications. Higher qualifications will enable librarians to acquire new knowledge and research skills which, if well developed, will enhance publication productivity and establish the appropriate knowledge base for the profession.
2. Since recognition is an important reinforcement for greater publication output, librarians should be recognised based on professional performance, innovations, and general contributions which they make on the job, not just when they win academic awards. The modalities of according such recognition would depend on the administrative style of the University Librarian. Such recognition could be expressed not only through formal letter writing or in the annual report, but also could be expressed verbally to the deserving individual during a staff meeting. This would encourage librarians to work harder and achieve more for the university.
3. Since responsibilities assigned to the librarians to do special work and exercise authority showed a positive effect on their publication output, it is recommended that those who have not been assigned administrative responsibilities should be given some so that they can grow professionally. Moreso, university librarians could make some responsible positions such as headship of units, sections, task forces, and divisions rotate after two years, so that librarians who have never been exposed to responsible leadership positions would benefit.
4. Extrinsic job satisfaction dimensions, e.g. salary, university policies and administration, office accommodation, job security, and supervision should be improved and made more attractive. Remuneration especially should be made more attractive to librarians and lecturers since Nigerians respond positively to monetary rewards (Ejiogu 1980). A situation whereby a university librarian or a professor who has put in not less than 20 years in service earns on the average only US$50 basic salary per month is not only sad and dissatisfying but pathetic. This situation is made worse by the current inflation rate of more than 72% coupled with the weak exchange rate of Nigerian currency.
5. The National Universities Commission (NUC) should create a Director of Library Services position to be filled by those librarians who have reached the rank of a University Librarian, but cannot hold such a position, since only one person can be the

University Librarian in a particular university. Such librarians, instead of stagnating at the rank of Deputy University Librarian could be promoted to the rank of Director and be placed on the same salary scale with the University Librarian and teaching faculty.

6. Research grants and allowances should be increased to accommodate the current rate of inflation. This will enhance morale and performance of professional duties which are already low among workers. Journal and research allowances should be increased and paid en-block at the beginning of each academic session. This will enable librarians to subscribe to foreign journals, which are the backbone of current research breakthroughs. The practice of paying these allowances with monthly salaries should be discarded because it does not enable one to subscribe to journals, especially from the developed countries.
7. Librarians should be sensitized to advancement prospects available on the job and really be motivated to make use of the various available resources, e.g. current information materials, time, grants, and academic allowances available for quality library services to clients as well as for publishing.

For academic librarianship to be meaningful and successful in African university settings, positive minded librarians who are enthusiastic, resourceful, and goal oriented for improvement by publishing library research results must be recruited and taken good care of in the profession. Librarians in Nigerian universities must be enterprising and ambitious to publish significantly as do their counterparts – university lecturers – who are involved in the teaching, research, and learning processes. If librarians do not publish, lecturers will look down on librarians for not fulfilling one of the major functions of the university which involves extending the frontiers of new knowledge.

REFERENCES CITED

Aguolu, C.C Staffing in Nigerian university libraries. **Library Review** 31,1 (1982): 18-29.

Alemna, A.A. The factor of publishing as a criterion for establishing the status of librarians in university libraries in Ghana. **African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science** 3,2 (1993): 133-140.

Atinmo, M.I. Some factors affecting job satisfaction in Nigerian library positions. **Careers** (Ibadan) 4, 1-2 (1978): 107-115.

Burgess, Susan Fay. Job satisfaction of reference librarians and cataloguers. **Australian Academic and Research Libraries** 13, 2 (1982): 73-81.

Chwe, S.S. A comparative study of job satisfaction among catalogers and reference librarians in university libraries. **Journal of Academic Librarianship** 4,3 (1978): 139-143.

D'Elia, George P. The determinants of job satisfaction among beginning librarians. **Library Quarterly** 49, 3 (1979): 283-302.

Douglas, E.O. Personnel management in academic libraries in an era of scarce financial resources, in **Proceedings of the National Seminar on Strategies for Survival by Nigerian Academic and Research Libraries During Austere Times, Ibadan, 9-11 November 1987**. S.M. Lawani et al eds. Ibadan: National Association of Agricultural Librarians and Documentalists, Academic Research Libraries Section of the Nigerian Library Association, 1988. 55-63.

Drucker, Peter F. **The Practice of Management**. London: Heinemann, 1972.

Edem, U.S. Job Satisfaction and Publication Output Among Librarians in Nigerian Universities. PhD Dissertation, University of Ibadan, 1995.

Ejiogu, Aloy W. Theories of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: An Overview and Critique. Hull: Department of Education, University of Hull, 1980. Mimeo.

Gellerman, Saul W. **Motivation and Productivity**, New York: McGraw-Hill for American Management Association, 1963.

Gruneberg, M.M., ed. **Job Satisfaction: A Reader**. London: Macmillan, 1976.

Harrison, K.C. Librarians as authors. **Library Association Record** 84 (1982): 200.

Herzberg, Frederick. One more time: how do you motivate employees? **Harvard Business Review** 46, Jan.-Feb., (1968): 53-62.

Hoppock, Robert. **Job Satisfaction**. New York: Harper and Row, 1935.

Houser, J.D. **What People Want from Business**. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

Jauch, Lawrence and William F. Glueck. Evaluation of university professors' research performance. **Management Science** 22,1 (1975): 66-75.

Jones, Ken. **Conflict and Change in Library Organisations: People, Power and Service**. London: Clive Bingley, 1984.

Lawal, O.O. The effects of economic recession on library provision and management. **Nigerian Library and Information Science Review** 4, 1-2 (1986): 1-20.

Lawal, O.O. A survey of task performance in library and information science work: the Nigerian perspective. **African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science** 1,1 (1991): 29-36.

Luthans, Fred. **Organizational Behavior**. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Marchant, Maurice P. **Participative Management in Academic Libraries**. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1976.

Maslow, Abraham. H. A theory of human motivation. **Psychological Review** 50 (1943): 370-396.

McNally, Peter F. Participation, satisfaction and quality of reference service in Canadian public libraries. **APLA Bulletin** (Halifax) 46,6 (1983): 65-67.

Mitchell, W. Bede and L.S. Swieszkowski. Publication requirements and tenure approval rates: an issue for academic librarians. **College and Research Libraries** 46,3 (1985): 249-255.

Nkereuwem, E.E. Issues on the relationship between job satisfaction, job attitudes and work behaviour among the staff in academic libraries. **Information Services and Use** 10,5 (1990): 281-291.

Nwafor, B.U. Nigerian libraries and publishing. **Nigerian Libraries** 23, 1-2 (1987): 50-79.

Nzotta, B.C. A comparative study of the job satisfaction of academic and public librarians in Nigeria. **African Journal of Academic Librarianship** 2,1 (1984): 6-11.

Onadiran, G.T. The place of research in library education. **Library Scientist** 5 (1978): 17-27.

Ononogbo, R.U. User satisfaction in a depressed economy: strategies for Nigerian university libraries, in **Proceedings of the National Seminar on Strategies for Survival by Nigerian Academic and Research Libraries During Austere Times, Ibadan, 9-11 November 1987**. S.M. Lawani et al eds. Ibadan: National Association of Agricultural Librarians and Documentalists, Academic Research Libraries Section of the Nigerian Library Association, 1988. 101-107.

Plate, K.H. and E.W. Stone. Factors affecting librarians' job satisfaction: a report of two studies. **Library Quarterly** 44,2 (1974): 97-110.

Porter, L.W. and E.E. Lawler. What job attitudes tell about motivation. **Harvard Business Review** 46, Jan.-Feb. (1968): 118-126.

Rayman, R. and F.W. Goudy. Research and publication requirements in university libraries. **College and Research Libraries** 41, 1 (1980): 43-48.

Roberts, N. Graduates in academic libraries: a survey of past students of the post-graduate School of Librarianship and Information Studies, Sheffield University, 1964/65-1970/71. **Journal of Librarianship** 5,2 (1973): 97-115.

Scheck, J. The writing librarian. **PNLA Quarterly** 34,3 (1970): 23-35.

Simon, H.A. **Administrative Behavior**. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Stephens, J.C. Not publishing, not perishing and not inspired. **Scholarly Publishing** 7,3 (1976): 195-202.

Stueart, R.D. Writing the journal article. **College and Research Libraries** 37, 2 (1976): 153-157.

Swasdison, Neena. Job Satisfaction of University Librarians in Thailand: An Analysis of Selected Factors with a Focus on Superior-Subordinate Relations. PhD Dissertation, Ohio University, 1989.

Tuckman, Howard P. **Publication, Teaching and the Academic Reward Structure**. Lexington: D.C. Heath, 1976.

Unomah, J.I. Academic status of librarians in Nigerian universities: real or mere academic limbo. **Nigerian Library and Information Science Review** 8,1 (1990): 28-50.

Vaughan, W.J. and J.D. Dunn. A study of job satisfaction in six university libraries. **College and Research Libraries** 35, 3 (1974): 163-167.

Vroom, Victor H. **Work and Motivation**. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Wahba, S.P. Job satisfaction of librarians: a comparison between men and women. **College and Research Libraries** 36, 1 (1975): 45-51.

Wheeler, Joseph L. and Herbert Goldhor. **Practical Administration of Public Libraries**. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

APPENDIX 1: CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARIANS BY SEX

Sex of Librarians	Frequency	Valid Percent
Male	121	59.9
Female	76	37.6
No Response	5	2.5
Total	202	100.0

APPENDIX 2: CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARIANS BY AGE

S/No.	Ages of Librarians	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	Below 30 years	12	5.94
2	Between 31 - 34 years	32	15.84
3	Between 35-39 years	39	19.30
4	Between 40-44 years	38	18.81
5	Between 45-49 years	40	19.80
6	Above 50 years	38	18.81
7	No response	3	1.48
	Total	202	100.00

APPENDIX 3:CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARIANS BY WORKING EXPERIENCE

S/No.	Working Experience years brackets	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	Below 5 years	35	17.32
2	Between 6 - 9 years	44	21.78
3	Between 10-14 years	35	17.32
4	Between 15-19 years	49	24.25
5	Above 20 years	38	18.81
6	No Response	1	0.491
	Total	202	100.00

APPENDIX 4: CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARIANS BY LIBRARY DIVISION

S/No.	Library Divisions	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	Circulation	13	15.34
2	Reference	24	11.88
3	Acquisition	30	14.85
4	Cataloguing	46	22.77
5	Research	22	10.89
6	University Librarian's Office	11	5.44
7	Faculty Library	15	7.42
8	No Response	23	11.38
	Total	202	100.00

APPENDIX 5: CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARIANS BY ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

S/No	Academic Qualification	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	BLS (First degree)	37	18.31
2	MLS (Second degree)	147	72.77
3	Ph.D. (Third degree)	13	6.43
4	No Response	5	2.47
	Total	202	100.00

APPENDIX 6: ALL THE NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES AND THE ONES SAMPLED FOR THE STUDY

GROUP A: FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES (CONVENTIONAL)

* Indicates Universities included in the sample

1. *Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
2. *University of Abuja, Abuja
3. *Bayero University, Kano
4. *University of Benin, Benin
5. *University of Calabar, Calabar
6. *University of Ibadan, Ibadan
7. *University of Ilorin, Ilorin
8. *University of Jos, Jos
9. *University of Lagos, Lagos
10. University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri
11. *Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Ife
12. *University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt
13. Usman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto
14. *University of Nigeria, Nsukka
15. University of Uyo, Uyo

GROUP B: FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES OF AGRICULTURE

16. *University of Agriculture, Abeokuta
17. University of Agriculture, Makurdi
18. University of Agriculture, Umudike

GROUP C: FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY

19. *Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi
20. Federal University of Technology, Akure
21. *Federal University of Technology, Owerri
22. *Federal University of Technology, Minna
23. Federal University of Technology, Yola

GROUP D: STATE UNIVERSITIES

24. *Edo State University, Ekpoma
25. *Abia State University, Okigwe
26. Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos
27. Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
28. *Ogun State University, Ago Iwoye
29. Ondo State University, Ado Ekiti
30. Delta State University, Abraka
31. Kano State University, Kano
32. Benue State University, Makurdi

GROUP E: STATE UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY

33. Enugu State University of Technology, Enugu
34. *Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho
35. *Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt

APPENDIX 7:
CORRELATION OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS ON ACADEMIC PUBLICATION OUTPUT

CORRELATION	ACADPUB	RECOGN	ACHIEVE	RESPONS	ADVANCE	SALARY	WORKIT	SUPERV	ACCOMM	LIBPOL	JOBSEC
ACADPUB	1.000	.171	.228	.175	.033	-.070	-.012	.103	.115	.086	.065
RECOGNT	.171	1.000	.491	.436	.482	.313	.321	.332	.251	.500	.333
ACHIEVE	.228	.491	1.000	.511	.457	.122	.373	.255	.081	.404	.290
RESPONS	.175	.436	.511	1.000	.408	.186	.362	.318	.167	.439	.311
ADVANCE	.033	.482	.457	.408	1.000	.396	.398	.317	.170	.650	.416
SALARY	-.070	.313	.122	.186	.396	1.000	.333	.248	.157	.495	.424
WORKIT	-.012	.321	.373	.362	.398	.333	1.000	.225	.255	.377	.246
SUPERV	.103	.332	.255	.318	.317	.248	.225	1.000	.135	.403	.205
ACCOMMOD	.115	.251	.081	.167	.170	.157	.255	.135	1.000	.151	.190
LIBPOL	.086	.500	.404	.439	.650	.495	.377	.403	.151	1.000	.437
JOBSEC	.065	.333	.290	.311	.416	.424	.246	.205	.190	.437	1.000

NOTE

ACADPUB = Academic Publication Output
RESPONS = Responsibility
WORKIT = Work itself
LIPOL = Library Policies and Administration
REGONGT = Recognition
ADVANCE = Advancement
SUPERV = Supervision
ACHIEVE = Achievement
SALARY = Salary
ACCOMMOD = Accommodation
JOBSEC = Job Security

APPENDIX 8: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACHIEVEMENT AND ACADEMIC PUBLICATION OUTPUT BASED ON SIMPLE LINEAR REGRESSION

Simple linear regression of librarians' academic publication output (ACADPUB) on their academic achievement (ACHIEVE):

Multiple R = .228
R Square = .052
Standard error = 2.030

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Regression	1	35.196	35.196	8.536
Residual	155	639.071	4.123	
Total	156	674.267		

Variable	b	SEb	Beta	t
ACHIEVE	.576	.197	.228	2.92
(Constant)	2.789			

*P<.05; df = 1,155; Critical F = 3.91

This meant that librarians' satisfaction with academic achievement made in terms of additional qualification showed a significant effect or relationship with their academic publication output.

(*P< .05; df = 1,155; F = 8.536)

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

APPENDIX 9: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONSIBILITY AND ACADEMIC PUBLICATION OUTPUT BASED ON SIMPLE LINEAR REGRESSION

Simple linear regression of librarians' academic publication output (ACADPUB) on their amount of responsibility (RESPONS) assigned to them in university libraries.

Multiple R = .175
R Square = .0306
Standard Error = 2.054

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Regression	1	20.656	20.656	4.90*
Residual	155	653.62	4.22	
Total	156	674.27		

Variable	b	SEb	Beta	t
RESPONS	.418	.189	.175	2.212
(Constant)	3.349			

*P<.05; df = 1.155; Critical F = 3.91

This meant that librarians' satisfaction with the amount of responsibility given them to exercise authority had a significant effect or relationship with their academic publication output (*P<0.05; df = 1,155; F = 4.90).

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

APPENDIX 10: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECOGNITION AND ACADEMIC PUBLICATION OUTPUT BASED ON SIMPLE LINEAR REGRESSION

Simple linear regression of librarians' academic publication output (ACADPUB) on their level of recognition (RECOGNT) showed as follows:

Multiple R = .171
R Square = .029
Standard Error = 2.055

Analysis of Variance

Sources of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Regression	1	19.72	19.72	4.67*
Residual	155	654.55	4.22	
Total	156	674.27		

Variable	b	SEb	Beta	t
RECOGNT	.435	.201	.171	2.16
(Constant)	3.33261			

*P<.05; df = 1,155; Critical F = 3.91

This meant that librarians' satisfaction with the level of professional recognition they received had significant effects or relationships with their academic publication output.

(*P<.05; df = 1,155; F = 4.67)

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

APPENDIX 11:
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECTS OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS ON ACADEMIC PUBLICATION OUTPUT DIMENSIONS

JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	STANDARD ERROR	df	SS	MS	F	b	SE b	Beta	t	RESULT OF ANALYSIS
1 Achievement	.228	.052	2.030	1, 155	35.196 639.071	35.196 4.123	8.536*	.576	.197	.228	2.92	*P<.05;df=1,155; Critical F = 3.91
2 Responsibility	.175	.0306	2.054	1, 155	20.656 653.62	20.656 4.22	4.90*	.418	.189	.175	2.212	*P<.05;df=1,155; Critical F = 3.91
3 Recognition	.171	.029	2.055	1, 155	19.71 645.55	19.72 4.22	4.67*	.435	.201	.171	2.16	*P<.0.5;df=1,155; Critical F = 3.91
4 Advancement	.033	.00109	2.0846	1, 155	0.734 673.536	0.734 4.345	0.169	.0643	.156	.033	0.411	df = 1,155; Critical F=3.91
5 Work Itself	-.012	.000144	2.0852	1, 155	0.297 673.973	0.297 4.348	0.068	-0.026	0.00996	-0.012	-0.261	df = 1,155; Critical F=3.91
6 Salary	-.070	.0049	2.0805	1, 155	3.304 670.966	3.304 4.329	0.763	-0.134	0.153	-0.0701	0.873	df = 1,155; Critical F=3.91
7 Supervision	.103	.0106	2.0746	1, 155	7.153 667.117	7.153 4.304	1.662	0.256	0.199	0.103	1.286	df = 1,155; Critical F=3.91
8 Office Accommodation	.115	.0182	2.0667	1, 155	12.289 661.981	12.289 4.271	2.88	0.289	0.1703	0.1351	1.096	df = 1,155; Critical F=3.91
9 University Policies & Administration	.086	.0074	2.078	1, 155	4.987 669.283	4.987 4.318	1.155	0.186	0.170	0.0859	1.075	df = 1,155; Critical F=3.91
10 Job Security	.065	.00423	2.0813	1, 155	2.849 671.421	2.849 4.332	0.658	0.148	0.182	0.0652	0.811	df = 1,155; Critical F=3.91

Note:

The result of analysis of variance statistics done showed that only three dimensions of job satisfaction namely achievement, responsibility and recognition had significant effect on publication output among Librarians in Nigerian Universities.

APPENDIX 12:
CORRELATION OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS ON WORK RELATED PUBLICATION OUTPUT DIMENSIONS

CORRELATION	WORKPUB	RECOGNITION	ACHIEVEMENT	RESPONSIBILITY	ADVANCEMENT	SALARY	WORK ITSELF	SUPERVISION	ACCOMMODATION	LIBPOL	JOBSEC.
WORKPUB	1.000	.126	-.061	.171	.043	-.072	.099	.063	.124	-.031	.090
RECOGNT	.126	1.000	.372	.340	.375	.206	.291	.247	.205	.315	.342
ACHIEVE	-.061	.372	1.000	.406	.413	.106	.295	.216	.045	.195	.369
RESPONS	.171	.340	.406	1.000	.266	.110	.293	.202	.186	.236	.235
ADVANCE	.043	.357	.413	.266	1.000	.320	.237	.217	.085	.504	.478
SALARY	-.072	.206	.108	.110	.320	1.000	.295	.047	.126	.404	.473
WORKIT	.099	.291	.295	.293	.237	.295	1.000	.220	.273	.162	.220
SUPERV	.063	.247	.216	.202	.217	.047	.220	1.000	.339	.095	.155
ACCOMMOD	.124	.205	.045	.186	.085	.126	.273	.339	1.000	-.029	.289
LIBPOL	-.031	.315	.197	.236	.504	.404	.162	.095	-.029	1.000	.443
JOBSEC	.090	.342	.369	.235	.478	.473	.220	.155	.289	.443	1.000

NOTE:

WORKPUB = Work Related Publication Output
RECOGNT = Recognition
ACHIEVE = Achievement
RESPONS = Responsibility
ADVANCE = Advancement
SALARY = Salary
WORKIT = Work Itself
SUPERV = Supervision
ACCOMMOD = Accommodation
LIBPOL = Library Policies and Administration
JOBSEC = Job Security

APPENDIX 13:
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECTS OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS ON WORK RELATED PUBLICATION OUTPUT

JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	STANDARD ERROR	df	SS	MS	F	b	SE b	Beta	t	RESULT OF ANALYSIS
1) Achievement	-.061	.0037	1.439	1, 67	0.518 138.732	0.518 2.071	0.250	-0.061	.251	-0.061	-0.500	df=1,67; Critical F=3.99
2) Responsibility	.171	.029	1.421	1, 67	4.072 135.178	4.072 2.018	2.018	.290	.204	.171	1.42	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
3) Recognition	.126	.0159	1.4318	1, 67	2.21 137.04	2.21 2.05	1.08	.242	.233	.126	1.04	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
4) Advancement	.043	.00018	1.44	1, 67	0.257 138.993	0.257 2.07	0.124	.065	.185	.043	0.352	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
5) Work Itself	.099	.0098	1.435	1, 67	1.365 137.885	1.365 2.058	0.663	0.165	0.202	0.099	0.814	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
6) Salary	-.072	.00518	1.438	1, 67	0.722 138.528	0.722 2.068	0.349	-.096	0.162	-.072	0.591	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
7) Supervision	.063	.00397	1.439	1, 67	0.553 138.697	0.553 2.07	0.267	0.136	0.263	0.063	0.517	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
8) Office Accommodation	.124	.015	1.431	1, 67	2.089 137.161	2.089 2.047	1.02	0.2083	0.206	0.124	1.01	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
9) University Policies & Administration	-.031	.00096	1.441	1, 67	0.134 139.116	0.134 2.074	0.065	-0.049	0.192	-0.031	-0.254	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99
10) Job Security	.090	.0081	1.436	1, 67	1.128 138.122	1.128 2.026	0.547	0.143	0.194	.090	0.7396	df = 1,67; Critical F=3.99

Note:

In Appendix 13, each of the ten job satisfaction dimensions was used in formulating a null hypothesis in testing its effects on work-related publication output dimension. The effect of each dimension was worked out with one way analysis of variance statistics. The above results show that none of the dimensions had positive or significant effect on work-related publication output dimension.

APPENDIX 14

Dept. of Library, Archival and
Information Studies.
University of Ibadan.
Ibadan, Oyo State.

3rd March, 1992.

.....

.....

.....

.....

Dear Sir/Madam.

Job Satisfaction and Publication Output Among Librarians in Nigerian University Libraries.

It appears that not much has been carried out to understand the relationship between job satisfaction and publication output among librarians who enjoy academic status like their colleagues - university lecturers. To fill this gap, this study is being undertaken to examine the influence of the various dimensions of job satisfaction on two dimensions of publication output.

For this study to achieve its aims and objectives, we very much count on your co-operation in responding to this questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Although the questionnaire is an elaborate one, it requires only ticking of the brackets that most appropriately represent your position. We therefore hope you will willingly find time and respond to it, please.

We promise you that all the information will be treated in strict confidence.

Thanking you for your anticipated co-operation and understanding.

Yours faithfully,

U.S. Edem.
(Research Candidate)

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS' OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE (ULOQ)

Note to University Librarians:

1 Please, do not write your name on the questionnaire. We are just interested in knowing your opinion about certain things.

2 The research is being conducted under the supervision of the Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

3 Your responses will be strictly for research purposes. Please respond honestly to each item.

4 Your answers and comments will be treated as confidential.

SECTION A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Please put a tick (✓) in the bracket that most appropriately represents your position.

1 Sex: (a) ( ) Male (b) ( ) Female.

2 Age: (a) ( ) Below 30 years old;
(b) ( ) Between 31 - 34 years old;
(c) ( ) Between 35 - 39 years old;
(d) ( ) Between 40 - 44 years old;
(e) ( ) Between 45 - 49 years old;
(f) ( ) Above 50 years old.

3 Marital Status: (a) ( ) Single (Unmarried);
(b) ( ) Divorced;
(c) ( ) Married;
(d) ( ) Widowed;
(e) ( ) Separated;

4 Status or Library Position:

(a) ( ) Graduate Assistant;
(b) ( ) Assistant Librarian;
(c) ( ) Librarian II:
(d) ( ) Librarian I;
(e) ( ) Senior Librarian;
(f) ( ) Principal Librarian;
(g) ( ) Deputy University Librarian:
(h) ( ) University Librarian;

(i) ( ) Others (Name) .....

5a Working Experience in University Library:

(i) ( ) Below 5 years;
(ii) ( ) Between 6 - 9 years:
(iii) ( ) Between 10 - 14 years;
(iv) ( ) Between 15 - 19 years;
(v) ( ) Between 20 - 24 years:
(vi) ( ) Between 25 - 29 years:
(vii) ( ) Above 30 years.

5b In what section or division of the University Library eg., (Circulation, Reference, Acquisition, Cataloguing) do you work?

.....

5c Are you the head of this section or division?

(a) ( ) Yes. (b) ( ) No.

6 Highest academic and professional qualification attained.

(a) ( ) First Degree eg., HND, BLS. B.Sc. BA, B.Ed.
(b) ( ) Second Degree eg., PGDL, MLS, M.Sc, MA, M.Ed, M. Lib, M.Phil.
(c) ( ) Third Degree eg., Ph.D, D.Ed, D.Sc.

(d) ( ) Others (Name) .....

7 What is your present salary per annum? (Please specify eg, EUSS, 8 step 2).

.....

8a Name of your University Library: .....

8b Which year did your University Library acquire academic status? .....

9 State (or, if an expatriate, country) of origin

.....

10a Which Library School did you attend last?

.....

10b Year of attendance: 19.... to 19.....

SECTION B: JOB SATISFACTION

Below are statements that express your satisfaction with different aspects of your work. For each item, indicate your feeling by putting a tick (✓) in the space that best express your level of satisfaction.	5	4	3	2	1
Really, how satisfied are you with:					
1 The recognition-appreciation and respect you get in the university library for the work done.					
2 The value the department attaches to the academic and non-academic contributions you are making generally.					
3 The achievement you are making in your academic pursuit in terms of additional qualification.					
4 The extent to which you are free to use your own judgement in doing your work.					
5 Opportunities given you to exercise responsibility and authority.					
6 Your participation in planning and administration.					
7 The possibility you have for professional growth.					

		5	4	3	2	1
8	University promotion policy as it affects university librarians.					
9	Promotion prospects and rate of progress on the promotion ladder so far.					
10	The opportunities-grants, time, facilities you have for your research work.					
11	The resources available to you in doing your work-secretarial services, stationeries etc.					
12	Opportunities for in-service training.					
13	Your present salary.					
14	Salary prospects.					
15	Allowances which come with your salary.					
16	Supervision of your work by only your boss on technical aspects.					
17	Human relations of your boss with regards to supervision.					
18	The physical conditions of your office-staying in the open space with readers to work.					
19	Staying in an exclusive office whereby access by readers and others is somehow restricted.					
20	University library policies and administration.					
21	Criteria used in promotion exercise for university librarians.					
22	Your job security (statutory protection from arbitrary dismissal and provision for retirement benefits).					
23	To stay on and retire on your job.					

		5	4	3	2	1
24	Your relationship with library users.					
25	Your relationship with your subordinates.					
26	Your overall satisfaction with your job as a librarian in a university library.					
27	The facilities-library facilities eg. computers, which you do not have in your library to work with.					

28 Your feelings about the number of publications expected from you before you are promoted.					
29 Utilization of your professional skills and knowledge by the job itself.					
30 Hours of work eg. shift duty.					
31 Pressure of work in the university library.					

Completely Dissatisfied = 1
Dissatisfied = 2
Undecided = 3
Satisfied = 4
Completely Satisfied = 5.

SECTION C: PUBLICATION OUTPUT/ACTIVITY

Below are questions set out to determine your publication output and activity on the job within the last seven years. Please, put a tick (✓) on the space provided that best express your answer. Also, give short answers where necessary.

32 How often have you served as an editor of a book?
(a) ( ) More than twice; (c) ( ) Once;
(b) ( ) Twice; (d) ( ) Never.

33 How often have you served as an editor of a Journal?
(a) ( ) More than twice; (c) ( ) Once;
(b) ( ) Twice; (d) ( ) Never.

34 Have you ever served as an editorial member of a journal?
(a) ( ) Yes; (b) ( ) No.

35 How many publications do you have in learned journals with ISSN number?
(a) ( ) None; (d) ( ) 8 - 11;
(b) ( ) 1 - 3; (e) ( ) 12 - 15;
(c) ( ) 4 - 7; (f) ( ) 16 and above.

36 How many of your papers have been published as proceedings of a conference or a workshop papers?
(a) ( ) None; (d) ( ) 8 - 11;
(b) ( ) 1 - 3; (e) ( ) 12 - 15;
(c) ( ) 4 - 7; (f) ( ) 16 and above.

37 How many in-house publications-staff bulletin articles do you have?
(a) ( ) None; (d) ( ) 8 - 11;
(b) ( ) 1 - 3; (e) ( ) 12 - 15;
(c) ( ) 4 - 7; (f) ( ) 16 and above.

38 How many books have you written?
(a) ( ) None; (d) ( ) Three;
(b) ( ) One; (e) ( ) Four;
(c) ( ) Two; (f) ( ) Five and above.

39 How many books have you co-authored?
(a) ( ) None; (d) ( ) Three;
(b) ( ) One; (e) ( ) Four;
(c) ( ) Two; (f) ( ) Five and above.

40 Are your papers or publications on Librarianship?
(a) ( ) Yes; (b) ( ) No.

41 If no, please specify other disciplines and the number of publications which you have in other disciplines? .....

42 When was your last promotion? 19.....

43 Have you ever received a research grant?
(a) ( ) Yes; (b) ( ) No.

44 How many times have you received research grants?
(a) ( ) More than twice; (c) ( ) Once;
(b) ( ) Twice; (d) ( ) Never.

45 Was the research grant enough for the study?
(a) ( ) Yes; (b) ( ) No.

46 Have you been able to publish your research findings after obtaining the research grant?
(a) ( ) Yes; (b) ( ) No.

47 Have you ever gone on research leave?
(a) ( ) More than twice; (c) ( ) Yes, Once;
(b) ( ) Yes, Twice; (d) ( ) No, Never.

48 Have you ever gone on sabbatical leave?
(a) ( ) More than twice; (c) ( ) Yes, Once;
(b) ( ) Yes, Twice; (d) ( ) No, Never.

49 Tick the number of items in each of the following categories of compilation which you have published and could be used in assessing your promotion on the job.

	Categories of Compilation	None	1 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 15	16 and above
a	Bibliographies						
b	Abstracts						
c	Indexes						

50 Tick the number of items in each of the following categories of writings which you have published in the field of Librarianship, Archival and Information Studies.

	Categories of Writing	None	1 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 15	16 and above
a	Periodical articles						
b	Newspaper articles						
c	Book reviews						
d	Letters to the Editor						
e	Occasional papers						
f	Pamphlets						
g	Others						

51 Does your publication activity/output hinder your ability to perform professional library duties?
(a) ( ) Yes; (b) ( ) No.

Thank you very much for finding time to fill this questionnaire.

U.S. Edem,
Doctoral Research Candidate,
Dept. of Library, Archival and
Information Studies,
University of Ibadan,
Ibadan, Oyo State.